Law Offices of Steven F. Bus, Ltd.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13 15

17 18

16

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Plaintiff filed his Complaint on May 3, 2012. At the time the Complaint was filed, to the Plaintiff's knowledge, his former employer, Bertolini Trucking, Inc. was no longer in business. The individual Defendants, BRIAN BERTOLINI and TIM VEDDER, were also formerly employed by Bertolini Trucking, Inc. Bertolini Trucking, Inc. had a principal place of business at one time in Marysville, California. Plaintiff then began to investigate the current whereabouts of both Defendants BRIAN BERTOLINI and TIM VEDDER. Plaintiff was unable to locate an existing address for either Defendant. Plaintiff then obtained copies of the bankruptcy pleadings for Bertolini Trucking, Inc. to ascertain any possible address. In fact, even the bankruptcy Trustee, Mr. Aceituno, was contacted for any possible information regarding the current whereabouts of said Defendants. Despite Plaintiffs extensive efforts to determine the current location of BRIAN BERTOLINI and TIM VEDDER, Plaintiff was unsuccessful. The only address Plaintiff could locate was the former address of Bertolini Trucking, Inc. at 3742 North Beale Road, Marysville, California. Since this was the only address Plaintiff could obtain, Plaintiff opted to attempt service at this address for both said Defendants. BRIAN BERTOLINI was successfully served at the Beale Road address but BRIAN BERTOLINI indicated that TIM VEDDER was not at that address. See Exhibit "1". Plaintiff is under the understanding that TIM VEDDER is a long haul trucker and his current whereabouts are unknown. All of the Defendants with exception of TIM VEDDER have now been served.

Given that Plaintiff is unaware of current address for TIM VEDDER nor does it appear the BRIAN BERTOLINI has any information as well, Plaintiff is requesting to extend the service period for an additional ninety (90) days so that service can be made upon the Defendant, TIM VEDDER.

 \mathbf{II}

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR SERVICE SHOULD BE GRANTED BECAUSE PLAINTIFF HAS SHOWN GOOD CAUSE

FRCP 4 (m) states as follows:

(m) Time Limit for Service. If a defendant is not served within 120 days after

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

the complaint is filed, the court - on motion or on its own after notice to the plaintiff - must dismiss the action without prejudice against the defendant or order that service be made within a specified time. But if the plaintiff shows good cause fo that failure, the court must extend the time for service for an appropriate period...

In this case, the Plaintiff has demonstrated good cause. The Plaintiff took extensive efforts to attempt to locate a physical address for TIM VEDDER without any success. Plaintiff then attempted service at last known address hoping to be successful but service was unsuccessful. Given that unlike the State Courts in Nevada, the Federal Rules of Procedure do not provide for publication of summons, Plaintiff is requesting the additional time in order to be able to physically serve Defendant TIM VEDDER. Plaintiff has demonstrated good cause in not serving the Summons and Complaint within the 120 day period. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff requests he be granted an additional ninety (90) day extension within which to serve the Summons and Complaint on Defendant TIM VEDDER.

DATED this Hand day of August, 2012.

STEVEN F. BUS. ESO.

Law Offices of Steven F. Bus, Ltd. 611 Sierra Rose Drive

Reno, Nevada 89511 (775) 825-2700

Attorney for Plaintiff

IT IS SO ORDERED:

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DATED: August 20, 2012.